

ORIGINAL

C-01575A-08-0328

Katherine Nutt



0000104461

From: Cristina Arzaga-Williams on behalf of Kennedy-Web
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2009 2:53 PM
To: Katherine Nutt
Cc: 'sksandra@aol.com'
Subject: FW: E-01575A-08-0328
Attachments: Sierra Vista Herald article re ACC reconsideration.doc

forward to docket control and print out and placed in review folder. thx

From: Leslie F. Kramer [mailto:kramerlaw@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 18, 2009 2:01 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Newman-Web; Pierce-Web; Stump-Web; Kennedy-Web
Subject: E-01575A-08-0328

Dear Chairpersons Mayes and Commissioners Pierce, Stump, Kennedy and Newman:

This is in regards to the article published in the Sierra Vista Herald the week of October 11, 2009 (copy attached), and SSVEC's recent motion for reconsideration which was granted by the ACC.

When reading the article, I was stunned by the comments made by Jack Blair describing SSVEC's view of those who spoke in opposition to SSVEC's rate increase request. If you will recall, I was the person who talked about my previous legal experiences with utility companies in Wisconsin and how SSVEC's current actions mirror that of my past experience of utility companies being obstinate and paternalistic. However, until reading the Herald article (how appropriate the newspaper is named given the content of the article!), I have never before heard a utility company expressing a belief that it was God, but Mr. Blair has now publicly accused those who spoke in opposition to the SSVEC's request before the ACC of engaging in *blasphemy*.

Such a description is truly beyond the pale for characterizing anyone's comments before the ACC at the August 19, 2009 hearing. It makes me wonder again exactly what it is that has this company so committed to the 69kV line, its proposed route, its reasons therefore, and its refusal to publicly explain its choice with supporting documentation.

It is my sincerest hope that the reconsideration hearing process will get to bottom of the issues and allow all concerned to move forward with a full understanding as to why SSVEC wants to spend the millions it proposes to spend at ratepayer expense. At the moment, the only thing I see is SSVEC continuing to pay money to engage in a fight to secure its position of not having to answer to its cooperative members. The ACC should not allow that sort of conduct by a regulated utility to continue to the detriment of its ratepayers—who are, after all, the company owners. The ACC should use the reconsideration motion hearing process for exactly that purpose.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie F. Kramer
SSVEC member

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

NOV - 2 2009

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2009 NOV - 2 A 11:18

RECEIVED

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--